

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

CONFIRMATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

APPLICATION NO. 09/748,995

FILING DATE 12/27/2000

Clare E. Woodman

F-180

6429

919

7590

07/21/2004

**EXAMINER** PARADISO, JOHN ROGER

PITNEY BOWES INC. 35 WATERVIEW DRIVE

P.O. BOX 3000

MSC 26-22

SHELTON, CT 06484-8000

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3721

**DATE MAILED: 07/21/2004** 

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Λ.,
Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/748,995	WOODMAN, CLARE E.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John R Paradiso	3721
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 11 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avairal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply to a high places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the control of the cont	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount of the correspondin	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension
ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offi imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ce later than three months after the mai	originally set in the final Office action; or ling date of the final rejection, even if
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI</li> </ol>		
2.⊠ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceli	ing a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>5-8</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	· 2
0. ☐ Other:		Pgno "
$\Theta$ $\Lambda$		9
Japoli, EXAMINER		EUGENE KIM
/ \		1.400

U.S/Patent and Trademark Office P/TOL-393 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 2. NOTE: The claimed "different proprietary control systems" raise new issues that would require further search. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but have been answered in previous Office Actions and are not deemed persuasive..